

**WSDOT/ACEC-WA  
Project Development Team Meeting  
Conference Call  
December 2, 2005**

**Attendees**

WSDOT

Ken Smith, Co-Chair  
Kirk Berg  
Doyle Dilley  
Rick Door  
Karl Kirker  
Ron Landon  
Keith Metcalf  
Amir Rasaie  
Rick Smith  
Adele McCormick

ACEC

Duncan Findlay, Co-Chair  
Lisa Reid  
Mary Holland  
John Villager

**Agenda Review**

No report from the Executive Committee.  
Deliverable Expectation Matrix will carry over to the next meeting.

**Status of Recommendation 9 – Co-Location Training and Lessons Learned**

Rick Smith

This recommendation has been rewritten. The idea is to develop a course to cover issues involved with co-locating. The best way to learn about co-location is to shadow someone in an office that has already co-located. Is there enough information of co-location to warrant a class, or should it be incorporated into other training with the recommendation to do job shadowing?

Developing a class right now will be difficult with the resources we have. It would be better to refine the recommendation to focus on shadowing rather than training.

Co-location is primarily being used with larger projects; some are design-build, but not all. A co-located team in a project office offers the most benefit over a long period of time. Short-term projects probably don't pencil out.

Revise the recommendation to focus on job shadowing, keeping in mind that the business manager is the person to start with. Include information on the three offices that are currently co-located.

We don't want to forget about the focus on team building between WSDOT and consultant staff. The net effect of teamwork has to have an affect on turnaround time and the review process.

**Action Item:** Rick Smith will revise Recommendation 9 on co-location and forward it to the rest of the group with a quick turnaround. Team members should send Rick comments. Ken Smith will take the recommendation to a meeting with the project development engineers on December 7, 2005.

### **Recommendation 8 – Prequalification**

Duncan Findlay

It would appear that there are avenues to accomplish prequalification, but it may ultimately involve legislation. There already are avenues to short circuit the procurement process under what is viewed as an emergency situation. There is the small works roster approach. There are a number of opportunities in the WACs and RCWs. This doesn't mean we can just go do this, but there are possibilities. There doesn't seem to be any constitutional prohibition, but it appears the legislature would have to be involved.

There are a couple of states doing similar things. Illinois is one of them. Lisa Reid should be getting more information back within the next couple of weeks.

Ken Smith spoke with Don Nelson and Mike Rice about prequalification. Don said that unless there is a statute somewhere that won't allow it that we should do it. Mike Rice doesn't think there is any problem with it, but it won't help us today. It can be done, but it will take awhile to get into place.

There is a question whether ACEC will have any reservations about prequalification. There is currently an agreement between WSDOT and ACEC regarding how often we go out with the on-call lists. The agreement was intended to relieve the issue of having to reapply every year. The whole issue here is to benefit the smaller firms, who are generally not ACEC members.

We need to check with the regions to find out what issues are working for them right now and what aren't. There is a problem when you run into end dates and then find the firm hasn't been selected for the new on-call list. If someone is working for us now, it would be beneficial for them to be eligible to take on more work even if they aren't on the new on-call. Some firms may not score well because the scorers don't know them, not because they aren't capable. As long as a firm is doing satisfactory work, they should be maintained.

What is unreasonable is that you have to go find another contractor because the contractor being used didn't make the new on-call. It's an advantage to keep the firms that are already familiar with the job.

We need every opportunity and option that is legal to hire appropriate contractors.

Rick Smith will draft this recommendation. Doyle Dilley and Rick Smith will meet and then get back to the team.

If you've never done work for the state, how do you get qualified? This is something that needs thought. We have always used the submittal process. Perhaps we can establish a group that will do those evaluations. That way they can establish a uniform method of evaluation.

We need to capture some of the roadblocks Mike Rice's office foresees in implementing this. We need more available engineers to deliver this program. We need to be able to bring them on as quickly as possible.

Duncan Findlay will talk to Bill Garrity from the Executive Committee to capture ACEC's concerns regarding this issue. Duncan would like to work with Rick Smith and Doyle Dilley. We need to find out if there are any obstacles to implementing this.

**Action Item:** Preliminary meeting and first draft should be accomplished for Recommendation 8 on Prequalification, for discussion at the next meeting. After Duncan's meeting with Bill Garrity, Rick Smith, Doyle Dilley, and Duncan Findlay will share feedback on this with the team.

The on-calls for UCO are not just restricted to UCO. That is the way they were advertised, although this is not what Ken Smith is being told. Ken will discuss this with Doyle Dilley.

### **Consultant Cost Templates, Etc., for Contract Negotiations - Status and Discussion**

Ken Smith

Ken Smith has been tasked with collecting template examples, but hasn't received any yet.

We aren't asking for the cost templates – we are asking for templates of how you communicate requests for work on a task order or process what you want delivered. Some task orders are poorly written and some are very detailed. We need examples from both sides. We are putting together a notebook and want examples of completed forms.

This is intended to be a website where people can see what has worked for others. People in the regions can look at it and find out how to accomplish things efficiently. Consultant services has a good website, but they don't have examples of what they expect.

Generally speaking, what Doyle asks for is a spreadsheet that they negotiate from. This is how we do MPD. Once you get through the scoping process, a spreadsheet is developed from the scope of work. We are looking for completed templates so those who have no experience or training with this can figure out what we are asking for. The Consultant Services Manual doesn't address this to the extent we are talking about.

If the regions will follow the process, with some advice with someone from Consultant Services to help them through the first one, they should be able to work through this. The project engineers should be leading this effort and they should have been through the estimating process, have done budgets. They can always call Consultant Services to ask for clarification.

**Action Item:** Team members should send examples of what has worked for them to Ken Smith electronically, so he can start putting them in an electronic notebook or on the Lessons Learned database.

### **Project Delivery Scheduling Problems Resulting from Environmental, NEPA, or Permitting Issues**

Duncan Findlay

The project delivery scheduling problem issues revolve around the Corps process. There is a redundancy of effort between FHWA and the Corps. Megan White and Headquarters Environmental are aware of the problem, but we haven't made much progress to solve this issue.

The Multi-Agency Permitting (MAP) team reports to Rick Smith. They are working in this area. Rick is also leading a joint meeting with FHWA called Program Delivery. The major issue that has come up is dealing with environmental issues, including the redundancy. This has been frustrating over the years and it hasn't changed very much. There are efforts going on at all levels. Doug MacDonald is chair of the AASHTO Standing Committee on Environment. What can this group do to add to the mix? There are already a number of people already working on it with high level involvement.

We have recently become a cabinet agency. It is the governor's responsibility to ensure we deliver on time and on budget. There is also a new office called the Office of Regulatory Assistance. Megan White and Rick Smith are meeting with that office next week.

The MAP team is at the project level. The advantage of having people participate is that they are all in the same place at the same time getting the whole picture. We feel that we are getting somewhere with this.

It appears there are already a lot of resources being applied to this problem now. We are just stating the obvious to bring it up again.

The examples Amir passed on to this group have also been passed on to those who are involved with these discussions, including Megan White.

Treatment of stormwater – treating for metals is a new phenomenon. We are starting to see this on large projects and we don't have a handle on the issue yet.

This group should be kept informed of what other groups are doing so we know what progress is being made.

### **Further Topics - Reduction of Project Delivery Time**

- Communicating clear expectations between WSDOT and consultants and vice versa could be extremely valuable. Focusing on the interaction between the state and the consultant.
- Right of way issues – acquisition.

### **Next meeting January 6, 2005, CH2M Hill**

#### **Agenda for Next Meeting**

- Prequalification
- Deliverable Expectation Matrix for QA/QC

How did this conference call work? Can we do this every other month? The only disadvantage is distributing last minute copies – everything needs to be e-mailed ahead of time. We can decide at the January meeting whether to have a conference call for the February meeting.

**Action Item:** Lisa Reid and Mike Mariano will put together a straw dog for the Deliverable Expectation Matrix